



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/723,016	11/27/2000	Masaki Morimatsu	SIMTEK5667	5642

25776 7590 09/30/2003

ERNEST A. BEUTLER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
500 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 945
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

EXAMINER

ADDISON, KAREN B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>09/723,016</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>MORIMATSU ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Karen B Addison</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>2834</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/23/03.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura (JP 4-368455) in view Sakamoto (5969455).

Nakamura discloses fig.2-4 an component rotating machine comprised of a plurality of coils (15d) each wound on the pole teeth of a core (15) through a bobbin (15c), the bobbin having portions surrounding the pole teeth of the core, a plurality of wiring conductors (18)(carried by the bobbin winding receiving portions), each of the wiring conductors having one terminal end (16) connected to one external electrical connector (14) through the terminal portion and the other terminal end of all of the conductors are carried by one of the matting bobbin (fig.2 -4) Nakamura does not disclose bobbins comprised of mating halves.

Sakamoto teaches in fig.14 concept of a bobbin comprising mating halves (1, 1b, 53,54,) encircle the pole teeth wherein the conductor are all carried by one of the matting halves for the purpose of forming a generator circuit. Therefore, it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the rotating machine of Nakamura with the bobbin mating halves of Sakamoto for the purpose of insulating the stator.

Art Unit: 2834

3. Claims 1 and 6-9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura (JP4-368455)) in view of Atherton (4656378).

As seen above in paragraph 2; Nakamura discloses substantially all the claim features including the coils combined into at least two groups with the coils of each group being continuously wound from a single wire conductor extending between ends of the wiring conductors. Wherein the other ends of said wire conductor are connected to the other terminal end of the wiring connectors (17) at a common external electrical connector.

Nakamura does not disclose the external electrical connector being adapted to cooperate with a detachable electrical connector through a male and female connector.

Atherton teaches the concept of having a motor stator in fig.1 comprising a stator (2) core having coils windings (6) connected a common external electrical connector (44) adapted to cooperate with a detachable electrical connector through a male (46), female (44) connection wherein the male, female connector is made in a direction that extends radially to the axis of rotation of the machine for the purpose of obtaining electrical power from the conductors. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the rotating machine of Nakamura with the external electrical connector of Atherton for the purpose of supplying power to the stator.

4. Claims 1 and 11-14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Atherton (4656378).

As seen above in paragraph 3; Nakamura discloses substantially all the claim features however; Nakamura does not disclose the external electrical connector being adapted

Art Unit: 2834

to cooperate with a detachable electrical connector through a male and female connector.

Atherton teaches the concept of having a motor stator in fig.1 comprising a stator (2) core having coils windings (6) connected to a common external electrical connector (44) adapted to cooperate with a detachable electrical connector through a male (46), female (44) connection wherein the male, female connector is made in a direction that extends radially to the axis of rotation of the machine for the purpose of obtaining electrical power from the conductors. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the rotating machine of Nakamura a with the external electrical connector of Atherton for the purpose of supplying power to the stator.

5. Claim 10 and 15-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Atherton as applied to claim 1 and 11-14 above, and further in view of Arai (JP7-163077) in view of Sakamoto (5969455).

As seen above in paragraph 4, Nakamura discloses a rotating machine comprised of a plurality of coils each wound on the pole teeth through a bobbin having portions surrounding the pole teeth of the core, a plurality of wiring conductors each of the conductors having one terminal end; and Atherton teaches a stator core having coils windings connected to a common external electrical connector.

However, neither Nakamura nor Sakamoto discloses a terminal hole (providing a circuit connecting for the connecting coils ends), connecting block, and bobbin halves.

Nakamura discloses in fig.1 and 3 a stator having a plurality of coil bobbins (4) connecting respectively to a pair of coils connected to the connecting terminal (10) comprising a terminal hole (13) and a connecting block (21) for the purpose of providing an electrically connections between a coil end with the terminal. Nakamura does not disclose a bobbin having mating halves.

Sakamoto teaches in fig.14 concept of a bobbin comprising mating halves (1, 1b, 53,54,) encircle the pole teeth wherein the conductor are all carried by one of the mating halves for the purpose of forming a generator circuit. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the rotating machine of Nakamura with the teaching of the external electrical connector of Atherton and modify it with terminal hole and connector block Arai and the bobbins mating halves of Sakamoto for the purpose of reducing the total size of the stator.

Referring to claims 5, no patentable weight has been given to the method of manufacturing limitations (i. e. molded) since "even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)

Referring to claim 10: the method of forming the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, this limitation had not been given patentable weight.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12/23/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument that the Nakamura fails to disclose terminals formed as part of the core bobbin is noted.

However, Nakamura clearly show the terminals (16) formed as part of the core of the bobbin (15c), see (col.1 line 0003).

In response to the applicant's arguments that the publication supplied with the office action was a different publication sent with the office actions dated 9/25/02 is noted.

However, a typo was made in the 1449 issued with the office action dated 9/25/02.

The reference mailed with the office action dated 9/25/02 is JP (4368455), which was cited in the second paragraph of the office action. Therefore, the arguments pertaining to JP (4-368445) are not persuasive.

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2834


mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen B Addison whose telephone number is 703-306-5855. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on 703-308-1317. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3431 for regular communications and 703-305-3431 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

KBA
September 16, 2003



KARL TAMAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER